On the Written Transmission of the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra*[*]

PHILIPP A. MAAS

1 The *Yogasūtra* of Patañjali with its oldest commentary, the so-called *Yogabhāṣya*, is one of the most widely read or, at least, one of the most often copied texts in the field of classical Indian Philosophy. I have been able to trace thirty-seven printed editions published from 1874 to 1992 and eighty-two MSS in public libraries in India, Nepal, Pakistan, Europe and the USA.[1]

1.1 Not only do these high numbers indicate the popularity of these texts – for which, in accordance with the information provided by the colophons, I use the title *Pātañjalayogaśāstra* (PYŚ) whenever I refer to them collectively – but also the fact that the PYŚ became the subject of at least three subcommentaries. The most famous, without doubt, is the *Yogasūtrabhāṣyavyākhyā* or *Tattvavaiśāradī* (TVś) of Vācaspatimiśra I, who must have lived at some time between 890 and 984/985 AD (Srinivasan 1967: 63). Although the exact dating of the PYŚ is not conclusively determined, a considerable gap of time and substantial differences in philosophical views clearly separates Vācaspati from the author(s)

---

[*] I would like to express my gratitude to Prof. Dr. Albrecht Wezler (University of Hamburg), to Dr. Harunaga Isaacson (University of Pennsylvania), and to Prof. Dr. Claus Vogel (University of Bonn) for reading provisional versions of this paper. Susanne Kammüller, M.A. was kind enough to check my English.

[1] I am currently preparing "A Hand-list of Manuscripts and Printed Editions of the Pātañjalayogaśāstra and the Commentaries thereon" for publication.

of the PYŚ. This is even more true of Vijñānabhikṣu's *Yoga-vārttika*, which seems to have been composed in the latter half of the 16th century.[2]

1.2 The third subcommentary is the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra-vivaraṇa* (YVi), which was edited on the basis of a single Malayālam MS and published under the title "Pāt[a]ñjala-Yogasūtra-Bhāṣya Vivaraṇam of Śaṅkara-Bhagavatpāda" (Rama Sastri & Krishnamurthi Sastri 1952). Whether or not the famous Advaitin Śaṅkara was the author of the YVi is, as far as I can see, not yet decided, and I am not at all inclined to enter into that discussion here. For my present purpose, it may be sufficient to emphasize that the YVi's importance for the history of Indian philosophy was immediately realized by scholars in Europe, Japan and the USA.[3] Even in India, in circles among modern Vedāntins, the first complete edition of the YVi was echoed by a reconstruction of the first chapter of PYŚ as it was commented upon by the YVi-*kāra.*[4]

1.2.1 To my knowledge, Wezler was the first to stress not only the YVi's philosophical importance but also its philological value. Almost filled with enthusiasm, he sums up his "Philological Observations" (1983: 32):

> ... [T]o anyone experienced in dealing with problems of textual criticism it becomes plain that the author of the Vivaraṇa knew or had before him a text of the Y[ogasūtra]Bhāṣya that is definitely older than that known to Vācaspatimiśra and comes hence much closer to the original.

1.2.2 Wezler is perfectly right in claiming that the YVi-*kāra* based his commentary on a version of the PYŚ that contained more original readings than the printed editions nowadays available. The

---

[2] For details see Larson & Bhattacharya 1987: 376.

[3] See for example (in alphabetical order): Bronkhorst 1985, Hacker 1968–69, Halbfass 1991, Mayeda 1968–69, Nakamura 1980–81, Oberhammer 1977, Schmithausen 1968–69, Vetter 1979, Wezler 1983, Whaling 1977.

[4] Vedavrata 1984. The edition adopts many more readings from the YVi than the version of the PYŚ printed together with the first complete edition of the YVi. It lacks, however, a systematical approach.

relation of these versions to Vācaspatimiśra's TVś is less clear. We neither possess a critical edition of the TVś nor a critical study of the basic text commented upon. Therefore, Halbfass (1991: 223) rightly demanded that:

> [M]uch further study of the textual tradition or traditions ... is needed before definite conclusions concerning the relative chronology of the Vivaraṇa and the Vaiśāradī ... can be drawn.

1.3 Although we are still a long way from "definite conclusions", our knowledge on the topic at hand has improved. Harimoto has prepared a new critical edition of the first chapter of the YVi considering more textual witnesses than were used for the first edition.[5] In preparing a critical edition of the first chapter of the PYŚ, I not only utilized the new critical edition of the YVi for a reconstruction of its basic text, but also had the chance to personally discuss preliminary results with him.

In addition to this valuable textual witness, I could make use of twenty-two printed editions and of twenty-five MSS in seven scripts and from different regions of the Indian subcontinent. In the first chapter the witnesses are at variance in nearly 2180 cases, of which about 900 are substantial.

2 The variant readings do not allow us to reconstruct the history of the PYŚ's transmission in detail, because it is contaminated. While preparing new copies, scribes often did not use a single exemplar but compared several MSS. This process can be proved for a large number of MSS containing so-called "corrections" in the margin of the folio or elsewhere. There is no agreement with regard to the question which of two or more possible readings is the original one, and, in some cases, even corrections were corrected, pointing to a double process of checking one MS against others.

---

[5] Harimoto (1999: 3–14) uses five textual witnesses.

Srinivasa Ayya Srinivasan has already assumed that contamination did not start in comparatively late times.[6] This also holds good for our text, as can be deduced from the fact that the textual witnesses – with the exception of some printed editions – do not form "solid genetic groups",[7] i.e., groups containing a high number of common errors that most probably did not creep into the transmission independently. In other words, contamination shows itself by the simple fact that no stemmatic hypothesis can satisfactorily explain the relationships existing among all witnesses (West 1973: 36).

3 Although contamination has been a constant factor within the transmission, its varying degrees have not altogether made stemmatical considerations impossible. There are several groups of witnesses discernible by the occurrence of errors shared by their members in a significant number but not in a regular pattern.

The two main groups are the "Northern group" and the "Southern group". The first of these is represented by nearly all printed editions and by all MSS from North and Middle India in Devanāgarī, Śāradā and Maithilī script. The Southern group is represented by MSS in Telugu-Kannaḍa script, in Grantha and in Malayālam script. The basic text of the YVi is also part of this group. Both main groups contain regional subgroups, and some late MSS from the South are difficult to sort into either of the two main groups. This is most probably due to the contaminating influence of the version transmitted by the Northern group which, in the course of time, seems to have gained the status of a normative recension and can, therefore, be designated as the Vulgate.

3.1 Within the Southern group the basic text of the YVi holds a special position, as it does not show close affinities to any subgroup. Although, for example, it exclusively shares a number of

[6] Srinivasan 1967, §1.1.11, p. 5.
[7] Srinivasan 1967, § 1.1.12, p. 6.

readings with a fairly old Malayālam MS, the total number of such readings is far lower than one would expect from the fact that all known MSS of the YVi are in Malayālam characters. If one takes into consideration that the basic text of the YVi preserves primary readings that are not shared by any other MS, its most likely position within the transmission is quite close to the common ancestor of the Southern group.

On the other hand, the "extraordinary testimonial value" (Wezler 1983: 32) of the YVi for a critical edition of the PYŚ is unfortunately limited by a number of factors. First of all, the YVi has come down to us in quite a poor state of transmission. Even its archetype (the common ancestor of all known MSS) contained a considerable number of more or less obvious errors. Secondly, the basic text of the YVi seems to have contained errors that are not transmitted by any other witness. Moreover, while judging readings from the YVi we have to keep in mind the possibility that comparatively late versions of the PYŚ have influenced its transmission, as scribes may have more or less consciously changed the wording of the YVi according to their knowledge of the basic text. Finally, the YVi-*kāra*, as a creative writer, cannot be expected to have slavishly stuck to his basic text. We always have to reckon with the possibility that readings of the PYŚ were ultimately invented by the YVi-*kāra* himself, in order to adapt the meaning of the basic text to his own philosophical views.[8] Therefore, any reconstruction of the YVi's basic text will always be fraught with a substantial amount of uncertainty that can only be diminished by a careful philological analysis of the YVi, on the one hand, and by

[8] In dealing with the YVi we have to keep in mind Steinkellner's remarks on using commentaries as hermeneutical tools: "On the one hand it is necessary to use those explanations which prove to be useful for an understanding of the basic text, and to distinguish these explanations according to their degree of authority. And on the other hand the extensions and digressions are to be examined with regard to their testimony for a development of the doctrine. Finally, if such development is to be met with, we have to pay attention to what extent this development has influenced the plain explanatory parts of the comments, too." (Steinkellner 1981: 283)

comparing assumed readings with the rest of the transmission on the other.

3.2 It is, of course, hazardous to propose any concrete dating for the time when the transmission was divided into two groups, but some general considerations may not be totally out of place. In any case, we are looking for an early date, as MSS transmitting the Vulgate are found in a vast geographical area comprising the whole of the Indian subcontinent with the exception of the extreme south. The period of time that has passed since this division must be long enough for regional subgroups to have developed. If a critical study of the TVś should support Wezler's observations and demonstrate that Vācaspati knew or had in hand a version containing typical errors of the Vulgate, the latest possible dating would be towards the end of the 9th century, although nothing prevents us from assuming a much earlier date.

4 Before discussing a number of variant readings capable of supporting the most basic assumptions of this general outline, it may be useful to describe the principles of textual criticism applied for the constitution of the text. A reading, in order to be adopted, has to stand a triple test. It must fulfil each of the following criteria (West 1973: 48):

1. [A reading] must correspond in sense to what the author intended to say, so far as this can be determined from the context.
2. It must correspond in language, style, and any relevant technical points ... to the way the author might naturally have expressed the sense.
3. It must be fully compatible with the fact that the surviving sources give what they do; in other words, it must be clear how the presumed original reading could have been corrupted into any different reading that is transmitted.

These criteria have been developed in the field of Greek and Latin classics, but to me they seem applicable in the field of Indian philosophical texts as well, although we face some difficulties. We usually neither know much about "the author" or "the authors" of a

given text, nor do we know much about the process of composing philosophical texts. Nevertheless, judging variant readings must, of course, involve considerations of language and style as well as of the context in which they appear.

4.1 With these considerations in mind, we can take a look at PYŚ 1.45. The non-uniform transmission of this passage bears out two stemmatic key facts:

1) The Vulgate is free from errors transmitted by the Southern group.
2) The basic text of the YVi belongs to the Southern group.

Table 1

Southern Version of YBh 1.45 (simplified)	**Vulgate of YBh 1.45 (simplified)**
*pārthivasyāṇor gandha***mātra*****tā***[1] *sūkṣmo viṣayaḥ*;	*pārthivasyāṇor gandha***tanmātraṃ*** *sūkṣmo viṣayaḥ*;
*gandhamātra***syāpi***[2]	*āpya***syāpi*** *rasatanmātram*, *taijasasya rūpatanmātram*, *vāyavīyasya sparśa-tanmātram*, *ākāśasya śabdatanmātram*, *teṣām ahaṃkāraḥ*, *a***syāpi***
liṅgamātraṃ, *liṅgamātrasyāpy aliṅgaṃ sūkṣmo viṣayaḥ. na cāliṅgāt paraṃ sūkṣmam asti*.	*liṅgamātram*, *liṅgamātrasyāpy aliṅgaṃ sūkṣmo viṣayaḥ. na cāliṅgāt paraṃ sūkṣmam asti.*

1) Ma^{g}, My^{t3}, Tv^{y}, Tj^{g}; gandhamātratā{sva YVi}rūpamātrateti EF^{g}, YVi 337,2.
2) gandhatanmātrasyāpi My^{t3}, Tv^{t}; **trasyāpi Tv^{y}; gandhamā{tanmā EF^{g}}tra {tralimṃgamātra<ṃ> EF}sva{*om*. EF^{g}}rūpamātrasyāpi EF^{g}, YVi 337,3.

4.1.1 YS 1.42–45 deals with a series of meditative states called *samāpatti*. This series consists of four *samāpatti*s which differ from each other by the subtlety of their respective meditative object. YS 1.45 describes the utmost degree of subtlety: *sūkṣmaviṣayatvaṃ*

cāliṅgaparyavasānam / "Furthermore, having [even more] subtle objects ends with [primordial matter, which is] free from any characteristic (*aliṅga*)." The *Bhāṣya* in its Vulgate version explains, in the terms of *sāṃkhya*-metaphysics, why primordial matter is the final depth layer of meditative objects:[9]

> *pārthivasyāṇor gandhatanmātraṃ sūkṣmo viṣayaḥ*; *āpya***syāpi** *rasatanmātram*, *taijasasya rūpatanmātram*, *vāyavīyasya sparśatanmātram*, *ākāśasya śabdatanmātram*, *teṣām ahaṃkāraḥ*, *a***syāpi** *liṅgamātram*, *liṅgamātrasyāpy aliṅgaṃ sūkṣmo viṣayaḥ. na cāliṅgāt paraṃ sūkṣmam asti*.
>
> The subtle object[-level] of the "earthen" gross element is the subtle element smell, and of the 'watery' [gross element] it is the subtle element taste; of the "fiery" it is the subtle element of form; of the "windy" it is the subtle element of touch; of the spacious [gross element] it is the subtle element of sound; their [subtle object-level] is egoity, and the [subtle object-level] of this is characteristic-only (*liṅgamātra*), and the subtle object[-level] of characteristic-only is [primordial matter, which is] free from any characteristic (*aliṅga*). And there is nothing more subtle than [primordial matter, which is] free from any characteristic.

Within the Southern group this passage is transmitted in two versions. Three Grantha MSS read *mātram* instead of *tanmātram* almost consistently, and, moreover, have *nābhasasya* instead of *ākāśasya*.[10] More important is the common reading of some other MSS belonging to the southern group – including the basic text of the YVi – that read a shorter text:

> *pārthivasyāṇor gandhamātratā sūkṣmo viṣayaḥ*; *gandhamātra***syāpi** *liṅgamātraṃ*, *liṅgamātrasyāpy aliṅgaṃ sūkṣmo viṣayaḥ. na cāliṅgāt paraṃ sūkṣmam asti*.

The difference results from a loss of text in an early ancestor of the Southern version. It can easily be explained by the double occurrence of *asyāpi* in two neighbouring lines of a common source. Presumably, a scribe slipped from one line to the other and over-

[9] For details see Oberhammer 1977: 198–209.

[10] These MSS are Ma^{g}, Tj^{g1} and Tj^{g2}.

looked the intervening text. The surviving *asyāpi* would, in a second step, have been changed to *gandhamātrasyāpi*, in order to improve the intelligibility of the sentence. If these assumptions are correct, the common source had around fourty *akṣaras* per line.

4.2 The non-uniform transmission of PYŚ 1.29 bears out one more stemmatic key fact:

3) The Southern group is free from errors transmitted by the Vulgate.

Table 2

<table>
<tr><th>Southern Version of PYŚ 1.29
(simplified)</th><th colspan="2">Vulgate of PYŚ 1.29
(simplified)</th></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">kiṃcāsya bhavati tataḥ pratyak-cetanādhigamo ’ntarāyābhāvaś ca (YS 1.29). ye tāvad antarāyā vyādhi-prabhṛtayas, te tāvad īśvarapraṇidhānān na bhavanti.
svapuruṣadarśanam[1] apy asya bhavati: “yathaiveśvaraḥ
śuddhaḥ, prasannaḥ, kevalo, ’nupa-sargas, tathāyam api buddheḥ prati-saṃvedī
madīyaḥ[2] puruṣa”, ity adhi{v.l.: va}gacchatīti.

1) EF^{g}, Tv^{y}.
2) EF^{g}, Ma^{g}, Tv^{y}, YVi 281,3.</td><td colspan="2">kiṃ cāsya bhavati? tataḥ pratyak-cetanādhigamo ’py antarāyābhāvaś ca (YS 1.29). ye tāvad antarāyā vyādhi-prabhṛtayas, te tāvad īśvarapraṇidhānān na bhavanti.
svarūpadarśanam apy asya bhavati: “yathaiveśvaraḥ puruṣaḥ
śuddhaḥ, prasannaḥ, kevalo, ’nupa-sargas, tathāyam api buddheḥ prati-saṃvedī</td></tr>
<tr><td>yaḥ puruṣas, tam adhigacchati.</td><td>puruṣa”, ity evam adhigacchati</td></tr>
</table>

“[T]he [yogin], moreover, acquires, *because of this* [*devotion to Īśvara*], *the realization of* [*his*] *inner consciousness* (pratyakcetanādhigama) *and the non-existence* (*or not coming into being*) *of* ‘*hindrances*’ (*antarāya*) [*on the yogic path*] (YS 1.29). Whatever hindrances there be, disease and so on, all these, because of devotion to Īśvara, do not come into being (or: do not exist). [T]he [yogin] acquires even sight (or: knowledge) of his own **Self** (*puruṣa*): ‘As Īśvara is pure, clear, alone and free from trouble, so also is **my** Self here that experiences [its] *buddhi.*’ Thus [t]he [yogin] realizes.”

4.2.1 YS 1.29 deals with two benefits the yogin acquires by devotion to Īśvara (*īśvarapraṇidhāna*). It reads: *tataḥ pratyakcetanādhigamo 'ntarāyābhāvaś ca*. "Because of this [devotion to Īśvara, the yogin acquires] the realization of [his] inner consciousness (*pratyakcetanādhigama*) and the non-existence (or not coming into being) of 'hindrances' (*antarāya*) [on the yogic path]."

The Vulgate-*Bhāṣya* is of little help in determining the meaning of *pratyakcetanādhigamo*. It reads: *sva**rūpa**darśanam apy asya bhavati* / "[T]he [yogin], moreover, gets sight (or: knowledge) [of his (or: the)] own-form." This passage is difficult. On the one hand, *rūpa* "form" goes quite well with *darśana* "sight" but the exact meaning of *svarūpadarśanam* here and its relation to *pratyakcetanādhigamo* from the *sūtra* is unclear. Should we assume that *svarūpadarśana* is not a gloss but rather states an additional result of devotion to Īśvara?

4.2.2 Both well-known commentators on the PYŚ, Vācaspati and Vijñānabhikṣu, solve the problem in peculiar but ultimately unsatisfactory ways,[11] and the YVi does not transmit the passage under discussion.

---

[11] Vācaspati comments: ***tataḥ pratyakcetanādhigamo 'py antarāyābhāvaś ca*** [YS 1.29] | *pratīpaṃ viparītam añcati vijānātīti pratyak sa cāsau cetanaś ceti pratyakcetano 'vidyāvān puruṣaḥ* | *tad aneneśvarāc chāśvatikasattvotkarṣasaṃpannād vidyāvato nivartayati* | *pratīcaś cetanasyādhigamo jñānaṃ svarūpato 'sya bhavat*[*i* |] (TVś 33,19–21). "From this [devotion to Īśvara results the] realization of a sentient being (*cetana*) that performs [mental acts] opposingly. [To explain *pratyak*: 'it] performs [mental acts] (*añcati*) opposingly (*pratīpaṃ*)' [means 'it] knows contrarily [to reality]'. 'A sentient being (*cetana*) that performs [mental acts] opposingly' [=] 'a person (*puruṣa*) possessing ignorance'. With this [expression the author] differentiates [the ordinary person] from Īśvara who is endowed with the perfection of [perceiving his] eternal *sattva* [and therefore] possesses knowledge. As a sentient being (*cetana*) that performs [mental acts] opposingly [t]he [yogin] acquires the 'realization' [=] 'knowledge according to its own form'."

This passage does not allow to reconstruct the TVś's basic text in detail. Vācaspati's interpretation of *pratyakcetana* may be caused by his difficulties in interpreting *svarūpadarśana* from the basic text.

Vijñānabhikṣu, on the other hand, comments (YVā 89,12f.): *svarūpadarśanam iti* | *asya pratīco jīvasya yat tāttvikam rūpaṃ tasya sākṣātkaro 'pi bhavatīty arthaḥ* | "'Sight (or: knowledge) of [his] own form' means 'he acquires

4.2.3 A quite simple solution is to accept a common reading of two MSS, one in Grantha and the other in Malayālam characters, that reads *sva**puruṣa**darśanam* "sight (or: knowledge) of the [yogin's] own Self (*puruṣa*)" instead of *sva**rūpa**darśanam*. The former reading, in my opinion, is a paraphrase of *pratyak-cetanādhigamo* "realization of [his] inner consciousness" from the *sūtra*.

4.2.4 There may, however, remain some doubt about whether *sva**rūpa**darśana* is not, in fact, the more difficult reading, and should, therefore, be regarded as primary. Although it cannot be ruled out entirely that, in the course of transmission, *svarūpa* was deliberately changed to *svapuruṣa*, it is much more likely that *sva-rūpa* is simply the result of the loss of the akṣara *pu*. The remaining *svaruṣa* would then have been "corrected" to *svarūpa*. This correction is quite obvious if one takes into consideration the similarity in North Indian alphabets of *ru* and *rū* on the one hand, and of *ṣa* and *pa* on the other.[12]

4.3 The following excerpt from the *Bhāṣya* not only supports *sva**puruṣa***° as the original reading by supplying a suitable context, but also contains a second error of the Vulgate.

4.3.1 "*yathaiveśvaraḥ śuddhaḥ*, *prasannaḥ*, *kevalo*, '*nupa-sargas*, *tathāyam api buddheḥ pratisaṃvedī* ***madīyaḥ*** *puruṣa*", *ity adhigacchatīti*. Syntactically, this passage is in the form of a direct construction with *iti* at the end. The main verb *adhigacchati* takes up the sūtra's *adhigamo*. The sentence before *ity adhigacchati* describes the content of the yogin's spiritual realization. 'As Īśvara is pure, clear, alone and free from trouble, so also is my Self here that experiences [its] *buddhi*.' Thus [t]he [yogin] realizes."

4.3.2 A slip of a scribe's eye got him to overlook the akṣaras *madī* right behind *pratisaṃvedī*. As a result instead of *pratisaṃvedī madīyaḥ* only *pratisaṃvedī yaḥ* survived. The second word can be

---

also the realization of the form which is the real (*tāttvika*) [form] of the inner individual soul (*jīva*)'."

[12] Bühler 1896: Tafel 4 and Tafel 4a.

taken as a relative pronoun, although, of course, it does not fit syntactically.

In the course of transmission, two scribes, presumably, chose different strategies to solve the syntactical problems caused by *yaḥ*. One scribe changed *iti* to *tam*, in order to construe an apodosis (*yaḥ puruṣaḥ*, *tam adhigacchati*), the other deleted *yaḥ*.

4.3.3 As in the example discussed above, there is no absolute certainty regarding the original reading. It is also possible, though much less likely, that the original version neither contained the possessive adjective *madīyaḥ* nor the relative pronoun *yaḥ*. I can see no reason why *madīyaḥ* should have been inserted here, and its presumable loss is easy to explain. Moreover, there is a constant line of argumentation that leads from the *Bhāṣya*'s gloss of *pratyakcetanādhigamo* as *svapuruṣadarśanam* to *madīyaḥ puruṣa ity adhigacchati*.

5 The analysis of variant readings in PYŚ 1.29 points to what, a priori, could have been regarded as most likely. At first, to quote Wezler once more (1983: 32), "...cases where what can be called 'secondary transmission' of a text turns out to be more valuable than all extant MSS. taken together, are not rare in our discipline", as are cases, I would like to add, where South Indian MSS are more valuable than northern MSS, impressive examples being Rau's observations on the transmission of Bhartr̥hari's *Vākyapādīya*,[13] as well as the *Jaiminīyabrāhmaṇa*, a re-edition of which is currently under preparation by Fujii and Ehlers (Ehlers 2000).

[13] Rau 1977: 30; 1991: 4.

ABBREVIATIONS AND REFERENCES

(a) Texts

Pātañjalayogaśāstravivaraṇa. *Pāt*[*a*]*ñjala-Yogasūtra-Bhāṣya-Vivaraṇa of Śaṅkara-Bhagavatpāda.* Critically ed. with introduction by Polakam Sri Rama Sastri and S. R. Krishnamurthi Sastri. (Madras Government Oriental Series, 94.) Madras 1952.

PYŚ *Pātañjalayogaśāstra* (YS along with YBh).

TVś *Tattvavaiśāradī* or *Yogasūtrabhāṣyavyākhyā* by Vācaspatimiśra I. *Pātañjalayogasūtrāṇi*. *Vācaspatimiśraviracitaṭīkāsameta-Śrī-Vyāsa-bhāṣyasametāni. Āśramasya paṇḍitaiḥ saṃśodhitam*. 4th edition. (1st ed. 1904). (Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series, 47.) Puṇyapattana [= Pune] 1978.

YBh *Yogasūtrabhāṣya.*

YS *Yogasūtra* by Patañjali.

YVā *Yogavārttika* by Vijñānabhikṣu. *Pātañjalayogadarśanam. Vācaspatimiśraviracita-Tattvavaiśāradī-Vijñānabhikṣukṛta-Yogavārtikavibhūṣita-Vyāsa-bhāṣyasametam*. ŚrīNārāyaṇamiśreṇa ṭippaṇīpariśiṣṭādibhiḥ saha sampāditam. Vārāṇasī 1971.

YVi *Pātañjalayogaśāstravivaraṇa*. In: Kengo Harimoto (ed.), *A Critical Edition of the Pātañjalayogaśāstravivaraṇa. First Part. Samādhipāda with an introduction*. A Dissertation in Asian and Middle Eastern Studies. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1999.

(b) Manuscripts and Catalogues

EF^{g} Digital pictures of a palm leaf MS containing the PYŚ in Grantha script from the Library of the “École Française d’Extrême-Orient, Centre de Pondichéry”, Pondicherry. Shelf No. 287.

Ma^{g} Digital pictures of a paper MS containing the PYŚ in Grantha script from the “Adyar Library”, Chennai. Running No. 24 (in Cat. Adyar). Shelf No. PM 1420.

My^{t3} Digital pictures of a palm leaf MS containing the PYŚ in Telugu script from the library of the “Oriental Research Institute”, Mysore. Running No. 35065 (in Cat. Mysore). Shelf No. P 1560/5.

Tj^{g1} Microfilm pictures of a palm leaf MS containing the PYŚ in Grantha script from the “Tanjore Mahārāja Serfoji’s Sarasvatī Mahāl Library”, Thanjavur. Running Nos. 9904 (in Burnell 1880) and 6703 (in Cat. Tanjore).

Tj^{g2} Microfilm pictures of a palm leaf MS containing the PYŚ in Grantha script from the “Tanjore Mahārāja Serfoji’s Sarasvatī Mahāl Library”,

Thanjavur. Running Nos. 9903 (in Burnell 1880) and 670 (in Cat. Tanjore).

Tv[t] Digital pictures of a palm leaf MS containing the PYŚ in Telugu script from the library of the "Oriental Research Institute", Thiruvananthapuram. Running No. 13474 (in Cat. Trivandrum). Shelf No. 11837A.

Tv[y] Digital pictures of a palm leaf MS containing the PYŚ in Malayālam script from the library of the "Oriental Research Institute", Thiruvananthapuram. Running No. 14371 (in Cat. Trivandrum). Shelf No. 622.

BURNELL, A[rthur] C[oke] 1880. *A Classified Index to the Sanskrit Mss. in the Palace of Tanjore*. *Prepared for the Madras Government*. London.

Cat. Adyar = AITHAL, Parameswara 1972. *Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS* [in the Adyar Library], VIII: *Sāṃkhya*, *Yoga*, *Vaiśeṣika and Nyāya*. (The Adyar Library Series, 100.) Adyar, Madras.

Cat. Mysore = MARULASIDDAIAH, Gurusiddappa 1984. *Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS* [in the Oriental Research Institute, Mysore], I–XV. Vol. 4B, 7–15 ed. by H. P. Malledevaru. Vol. 10: *Vyākaraṇa*, *Śilpa*, *Ratnaśāstra*, *Kāmaśāstra*, *Arthaśāstra*, *Sāṃkhya*, *Yoga*, *Pūrvamīmāṃsā*, *Nyāya*. (Oriental Research Institute Series, 144.) Mysore.

Cat. Tanjore = S[UBRAHMANYA] SASTRI, P[alamadai] P[ichumani] 1931. *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Tanjore Mahārāja Serfoji's Sarasvatī Mahāl Library*, *Tanjore*, I–XIX. Vol. 11: *Vaiśeṣika*, *Nyāya*, *Sāṅkhya and Yoga*. Srirangam.

Cat. Trivandrum = BHASKARAN, T. 1984. *Alphabetical Index of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Oriental Research Institiute and Manuscript Library*, *Trivandrum*. Vol. 3: *ya to ṣa*. (Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, 254.) Trivandrum.

(c) Secondary Sources

BRONKHORST, Johannes 1985. Patañjali and the Yoga sūtras. *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 10: 191–212.

BÜHLER, Georg 1896. *Indische Palaeographie von circa 350 a. Chr. – circa 1300 p. Chr*. (Grundriss der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde, 1.11.) Strassburg.

EHLERS, Gerhard 2000. Auf dem Weg zu einer neuen Edition des Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa. *Berliner Indologische Studien* 13/14: 1–28.

HACKER, Paul 1968–69. Śaṅkara der Yogin und Śaṅkara der Advaitin. Einige Beobachtungen. In: G[erhard] Oberhammer (ed.), *Beiträge zur Geistesgeschichte Indiens. Festschrift für Erich Frauwallner aus Anlass seines*

70. Geburtstages (= *WZKSO* 12–13): 119–148. Wien. (Reprint in Hacker 1978: 213–242.)

—— 1978. *Kleine Schriften*. Hrsg. von Lambert Schmithausen. (Glasenapp-Stiftung, 15.) Wiesbaden.

HALBFASS, Wilhelm 1991. *Tradition and Reflection. Explorations in Indian Thought*. New York.

LARSON, Gerald James & Ram Shankar BHATTACHARYA (eds.) 1987. *Sāṃkhya. A Dualist Tradition in Indian Philosophy.* (Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies, 4.) Delhi.

MAYEDA, Sengaku 1968–69. The Advaita theory of perception. In: G[erhard] Oberhammer (ed.), *Beiträge zur Geistesgeschichte Indiens. Festschrift für Erich Frauwallner aus Anlass seines 70. Geburtstages* (= *WZKSO* 12–13): 221–239. Wien.

NAKAMURA, Hajime 1980–81. Śaṃkara's Vivaraṇa on the Yogasūtra-Bhāṣya. *The Adyar Library Bulletin* 44–45: 475–485.

OBERHAMMER, Gerhard 1977. *Strukturen yogischer Meditation. Untersuchungen zur Spiritualität des Yoga.* (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte, 322 = Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Südasiens, 13.) Wien.

RAU, Wilhelm (ed.) 1977. *Bhartr̥haris Vākypadīya* [1]. *Die Mūlakārikās nach den Handschriften herausgegeben und mit einem Pāda-Index versehen*. (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, 42.4.) Wiesbaden.

—— (ed.) 1991. *Bhartr̥haris Vākypadīya 2. Text der Palmblatthandschrift Trivandrum S.N. 532 (= A*). (Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur: Abhandlung der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, 7.) Stuttgart.

SCHMITHAUSEN, Lambert 1968–69. Zur advaitischen Theorie der Objekterkenntnis. In: G[erhard] Oberhammer (ed.), *Beiträge zur Geistesgeschichte Indiens. Festschrift für Erich Frauwallner aus Anlass seines 70. Geburtstages* (= *WZKSO* 12–13): 329–360. Wien.

SRI RAMA SASTRI, Polakam & S. R. KRISHNAMURTHI SASTRI (eds.) 1952. *Pāt[a]ñjala-Yogasūtra-Bhāṣya-Vivaraṇa of Śaṅkara-Bhagavatpāda*. Critically edited with introduction. (Madras Government Oriental Series, 94.) Madras.

SRINIVASAN, Srinivasa Ayya (ed.) 1967. *Vācaspatimiśras Tattvakaumudī. Ein Beitrag zur Textkritik bei kontaminierter Überlieferung*. (Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien, 12.) Hamburg.

STEINKELLNER, Ernst 1981. Philological remarks on Śākyamati's Pramāṇavārttikaṭīkā. In: Klaus Bruhn & Albrecht Wezler (eds.), *Studien zum*

Jainismus und Buddhismus. Gedenkschrift für Ludwig Alsdorf (Alt- und Neuindische Studien, 23): 283–295. Wiesbaden.

VEDAVRATA (ed.) 1984. *Śrī-Pātañjala-Yogasūtrabhāṣyam*. *<śrīgovinda-bhagavatpūjyapāda-śiṣya-paramahaṃsa-parivrājakācarya-śrīśaṅkara-bhagavat-kr̥ta-vivaraṇānusāri.> Hindī-vivr̥ti-sahitaṃ*. [Vol. 1: *Samādhi-pāda*.] Vyākhyātā: Saccidānanda Yogī Sarasvatī.

VETTER, Tilmann 1979. *Studien zur Lehre und Entwicklung Śaṅkaras*. (Publications of the De Nobili Research Library, 6.) Wien.

WEST, Martin L[itchfield] 1973. *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique Applicable to Greek and Latin Texts*. Stuttgart.

WEZLER, Albrecht 1983. Philological observations on the so-called Pātañjala-yogasūtrabhāṣyavivaraṇa (Studies in the Pātañjalayogaśāstravivaraṇa I). *Indo-Iranian Journal* 25: 17–40.

WOODS, James Haughton (trans.) 1914. *The Yoga-System of Patañjali. Or the Ancient Hindu Doctrine of Concentration of Mind*, *Embracing the Mnemonic Rules*, *Called Yoga-Sūtras*, *of Patañjali and the Comment*, *Called Yoga-Bhāshya*, *Attributed to Veda-Vyāsa*, *and the Explanation*, *called Tattva-Vaiçāradī*, *of Vāchaspati-Miçra.* (Harvard Oriental Series, 17.) Cambridge, Mass. (Reprint: Delhi 1992.)